

2014

2014-10-13 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Common Academic Program Committee, "2014-10-13 Common Academic Program Committee Minutes" (2014). *Common Academic Program Committee Minutes*. Paper 48.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/capc_mins/48

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Common Academic Program Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu.

Minutes of the Common Academic Program Committee (CAPC)

Date: October 13, 2014

Location: LTC Forum

Present:

Sawyer Hunley (acting Chair)
Lee Dixon
Elias Toubia
Jim Dunne
Fred Jenkins (ex-officio)
Joan Plungis

Riad Alakkad (ex-officio)
Jennifer Creech
Joe Mashburn
Kathryn Kinnucan-Welsch (ex-officio)
Terence Lau (ex-officio)
Don Pair

Absent:

Juan Santamarina (Chair), John White

Guests:

Jayesh Prasad, MIS; Thomas Ferratt, MIS

A. Review of MIS 302 - Systems Thinking in Organizations

1. Addendum to proposal
 - a. The presenter distributed a copy of what should have been included in the online proposal's section "Describe how this course will satisfy each of the selected University of Dayton Student Learning Outcomes identified above." The text did not migrate properly online.
 - b. Sawyer will replace the text in CIM.
2. Discussion/comments:
 - a. The presenters were commended for submitting an excellent proposal. The self-rating section is particularly compelling in its support of the Community SLO.
 - b. Q: Is there any precedent for such a course being available to such a wide spread of the student body?
A: No, not that the presenter is aware of.
 - c. Due to faculty sabbatical plans, the course will be available for the first time in Spring 2016, and will be offered only once per year.
 - d. The presenter was asked to share what he learned about CAP in the process of developing this proposal, and how his understanding of the CAP SLOs was increased.
 - What impressed him most were the elements of integration across the curriculum, and the opportunities to build upon previously developed course content.
3. Vote:
 - a. Motion and second motion made to approve MIS 302 with the addition of the text submitted during this meeting.
 - b. 7-0-1 (for, against, abstained) – course approved with one abstention due to missing the discussion.

B. Review of CAPC Guidelines

1. Juan's proposal revisions to Section 4.1 of the CAPC Guidelines were presented by Sawyer.
2. Discussion/comments:
 - a. Correct the name of the School of Education to include "and Health Services."
 - b. Perhaps clarify what is meant by "courses already approved but being revised after approval" and what is meant by a "minor" change.
 - Ensuing discussion included an example: what if a course were approved that had prereqs, but in the future the prereqs were eliminated - would this change in CIM and generate a full CAPC review? And if an approved course without prereqs was subsequently assigned a prereq, would this require a full review, and would the CAPC need to review the prereq?
 - The CAPC focus is on reviewing the course, not the course's prereqs. That being said, during review of a proposal for an integrative course the prereqs may also be peripherally reviewed.
 - Another example: MGT 490, the Business Capstone, was approved as an integrative course for the SBA. Students in the 150-hour Accounting Program don't take MGT 490, which means they can't satisfy the CAP requirement to complete a capstone course. This problem could be solved by assigning an MBA-level number to this course. According to these guidelines, it appears this change must be resubmitted for review.
 - This may be deemed simply a logistical change.
 - Example #3: the Marketing Capstone proposal has not yet been submitted, but will likely include a 6-9 hour prereq stipulation. If approved by CAPC, would a decision to subsequently reduce the required prereq hours necessitate another review by the CAPC?
 - The CAPC should be notified of the change, but only after a review at the level of the academic unit(s).
 - The unit(s) can make a preliminary determination as to the level of change being minor or major, and the CAPC will reserve the right to override this determination.
 - For minor changes, the CAPC can offer beneficial feedback, which is not the same as having to approve the change.
 - Consensus was reached: in light of this section of the guidelines being intended only to help discern whether or not to use the proposal form, the text related to what constitutes a particular level of change is deemed sufficient.
 - Consensus reached that Sawyer will use the comments to revise Juan's draft and will distribute the updated draft to the Committee for review.

C. Review of CAP Course Proposal Tips

1. This document is intended to provide guidance when writing a proposal for CAPC review.
2. Discussion/comments:
 - a. It was noted that the sections and items displayed in this document are not numbered this way in CAP CIM.
 - b. On page 2, under the "Section 2: Course Content Information" heading, the tips include that the course goals, objectives, and content should reflect the CAP component content and the UD CAP SLOs.
 - This relates to discussions in previous meetings about the perceived lack of such reflective descriptions in the course content sections.

- It was suggested that the Committee might need to determine the extent to which a proposal must include course content that specifically relates to the working in the SLO, and to then share this expectation explicitly in the Tips document.
 - Existing courses being reviewed for CAPC approval may in particular require revisions to the course description in order to reflect the UD CAP SLO terminology.
 - The CAPC members may not be familiar with the proposal's discipline - requests for clarification during a review are not intended to be punitive, but simply to enhance and increase understanding.
 - The CAPC resists any perception of being a "rubber stamp" committee, and will continue to pursue any means to understand the intent of a proposal, while helping presenters to understand the requirements for CAPC approval.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jeanne Zeek